DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 076 570 SP 006 501

AUTHOR Larimore, David L.; And Others
TITLE Personality, Attitude, Professional Knowledge of Teachers in Experiential and Conventional Preparatory Programs.
PUB DATE Feb 73
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, February 1973

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Attitudes; Methods Courses; *Personality Studies; Preservice Education; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Education; *Teaching Styles

ABSTRACT

Dimensions of personality and value structure were related to preferences for field activities among preservice teachers. These dimensions included authoritarianism; traditionalism of educational views; progressivism of educational views; child centeredness; institutional centeredness; situational knowledge of practical wisdom in teaching; and beliefs about the nature of knowledge, learning, the learner, and the function of the school. The teaching-related activities were those encountered in self-selected field experiences of students in an experience-based experimental teacher education program. The data indicate that students with more progressive attitudes tend to exhibit a wider range of involvement, spend more time, and perform better on situation knowledge tests. (Author)

ED 076570

Personality, Attitude, Professional Knowledge of Teachers in Experiential and Conventional Preparatory Programs

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

David L. Larimore, Louise S. Musser, and Edgar L. Sagan

University of Kentucky

SP 006 501

Presented at the Annual Meeting

of the American Educational Research Association

on February 28, 1973

in New Orleans, Louisiana

The assistance of the following people is gratefully acknowledged: Henry Cole and Dan Arnold for initial design and instrument selection; Jonni Fitch, Linda Francis, Edward Kifer, Patricia Thomson and William Brown in data preparation and analysis and Theodore Strickland, Ann Harvey and Jack Rose in collecting the data.

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

The Cole and Musser (1973) and LaBrecque and Ravitz (1973) papers describe the development of the experimental program. In the interest of evaluating and improving the program, those people in charge of planning the experimental program asked for assistance in determining the differences between students in regular and experimental sections.

In early planning meetings involving the program development and evaluation staff members, discussions were held concerning the broad goals for the experimental and regular programs. These discussions included dialogue about appropriate instruments to measure relative outcomes for the two groups. The program developers felt teachers should be more practically oriented or real-world oriented. Therefore, the Teaching Situation Reaction Test (TSRT) was selected to measure teachers' reactions to practical situations. The program developers felt teachers should be more flexible and less judgmental and attuned to a wide range of differences in values and life styles. Therefore, the Rokeach D Scale was selected to measure the degree of dogmatism or closemindedness. Program developers also felt teachers should be more child-centered, more sensitive to children and their needs, and less content-centered. Therefore, the Education Scale was selected to measure the degree of child versus institutional centeredness and progressivism and traditionalism of the pre-service teachers in both programs. Finally, the program developers felt teachers should

be more knowledgeable about working in inner-city schools having racially mixed groups. Therefore, the Urban Education Scale was selected to measure teachers' knowledge concerning Urban Education. In addition, an Activity Preference Questionnaire designed to measure the types and frequencies of field activities across the two groups was constructed (Cole and Musser, 1973).

The program developers hypothesized that experimental sections and traditional sections would differ with respect to each of the selected measures. Although it was not felt that directional hypotheses were justified, the program developers did feel the experimental group should have higher scores on the Teaching Situation Reaction Test, lower scores on the Rokeach D Scale, higher progressivism scores on the Education Scale, and higher scores on the Urban Education Scale. It was also expected that the experimental group would score higher on the eleven APQ variables described in the Cole and Musser (1973) paper.

Method

Data from two studies are involved in this report and two sets of questions were asked. The study of the first year's data involved only the postest data since the experimental project was initiated without the collection of pretest data. The second year's data included only the pretests on all variables except the eleven APQ scales. Postests on the TSRT, Rokeach D Scale, Urban Education Scale and Education Scale will not be administered until Spring 1973. Cole and Musser report

postest differences on the eleven APQ variables across the experimental and regular groups in the second study.

Questions for Study Number One.

There are three questions which were raised for the first year study. These are:

1. How are the students in the experimental and traditional programs different at the end of the first year of the program on the Teaching Situation Reaction Test (TSRT), Rokeach Dogmatism Scale, Urban Education Scale and Education Scale? These four tests are hereafter collectively referred to as the "TRUE" variables standing for the first letters in each of the above mentioned measures.

2. How are the experimental and regular sections different on the Activity Preference Questionnaire?

3. Are the experimental and traditional sections different on these variables as a function of the program or are they different as a function of self-selection? There was no way to answer this last question from the first year's data.

Question 1 is answered in this paper. Question 2 is answered in the Cole and Musser paper. Question 3 was answered in the second study and is reported in this paper.

Questions for Study Number Two.

Again in the second study, there were three questions of interest. These are:

1. How are the students entering the experimental and traditional programs different on the TRUE variables?

2. How are the students entering the experimental and traditional programs different on the Omnibus Personality Inventory Scales?

3. How are the students in the experimental and traditional programs different on the Activity Preference Questionnaire variables after one semester of their respective programs?

Questions 1 and 2 are answered in this paper. Again, question 3 is answered in the Cole and Musser paper.

Methodology of Study Number One.

One experimental section of Human Growth and Development and Social and Philosophic Foundations having 33 students was compared with students sampled from sections completing the traditional Human Growth and Development and Social and Philosophic Foundations course. This sample had an n of 26. The experimental group in the first study (E_1) received a one year experiential course which integrated Human Growth and Development and Social and Philosophic Foundations and emphasized a practical field orientation. The ten conventional sections received the Human Growth and Development course followed by the Social and Philosophic Foundations course taught in typical campus classroom settings.

The evaluation of the study began late in the school year and the hastily developed plans called for administering the four TRUE instruments plus the Activity Preference Questionnaire. The experimental group failed to administer the Urban Education Scale and the

regular group failed to administer the TSRT. A number of instructors in regular sections refused to administer any of the instruments, thereby reducing the sample size of the R_1 group. Therefore, only the hypotheses concerning the Rokeach and Education Scale could be tested. These facts are indicative of problems involved in evaluating emergent programs in which only voluntary arrangements exist for collecting data across all groups.

Methodology of Study Number Two.

In the second year of the project, much better plans were made for conducting the experiment. Three experimental groups consisting of 98 students who presently have received one half of the year long treatment, and ten conventional sections involving 149 students who presently also have completed one half of the conventional treatment were administered the TRUE measures as pretests. Both groups were pretested on the TRUE variables. Therefore, it is possible to determine whether entry differences exist between the two groups. Both groups were postested on the APQ after one semester of their respective treatments. Both groups will be postested on the TRUE variables during the Spring Semester, 1973.

Results

The results for Study Number One are presented first and are followed by the results from Study Number Two. The first experimental question asked whether differences exist on the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale and the Education Scale between experimental and regular sections after

one year of their respective instructional treatments? A one-way analysis of variance was used to test the null hypothesis that there was no difference between the groups on the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale and the Education Scale. Table 1 is a summary table for the analysis of variance for the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Insert Table 1 about here.
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Table 2 is a summary table for the analysis of variance on the Education Scale.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Insert Table 2 about here.
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

The resulting F ratios for both hypothesis tests are not significant. Therefore, the hypothesis that the experimental and regular groups were equal on the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale and the Education Scale could not be rejected.

In the first study, it was not possible to compare the experimental Human Growth and Development and Social and Philosophic Foundations students with the regular Human Growth and Development and Social and Philosophic Foundations group on the TSRT since the regular R_1 group was not administered the TSRT. The TSRT was, however, administered to the regular groups which had only completed the Human Growth and Development portion of their treatment. A comparison can be made between the experimental group with a full year of treatment and the regular group with one half year treatment. The question was whether the experimental

Table 1

Comparison of Experimental (E_1) Versus

Regular (R_1) Groups on Rokeach Dogmatism Scale

	Level	Sum	Mean	Observations
Experimental 202-301	1	-1071	-34.548	31
Regular 202-301	2	- 966	-35.778	27

Grand Mean = -35.121

One-Way Analysis of Variance

Source	Corrected Sums of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F	Approximate Significance Level
Between Levels	21.875	1	21.875	.02	.90
Error	71676.312	56	1279.934		
TOTAL	71698.187	57			

Table 2

Comparison of Experimental (E_1) Versus

Regular (R_1) Groups on Ed Scale

	Level	Sum	Mean	Observations
Experimental 202-301	1	434	14.000	31
Regular 202-301	2	340	12.593	27

Grand Mean = 13.345

One-Way Analysis of Variance

Source	Corrected Sums of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F	Approximate Significance Level
Between Levels	28.586	1	28.586	.17	.22
Error	9662.520	56	172.545		
TOTAL	9691.105	57			

and this regular group differed on the TSRT after one year and one half year of their respective treatments. The null hypothesis tested by means of a one-way analysis of variance was that the experimental and regular groups would be equal on the TSRT. Table 3 is a summary table for the analysis of variance with respect to the TSRT for these groups.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Insert Table 3 about here.
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

There is a difference between the means for the two groups and the difference is in the favor of the experimental group although the F ratio does not reach the significance criterion at the .05 level. The significance criterion was not reached and the null hypothesis that the experimental and regular groups were equal cannot be rejected.

The results from Study Number Two are presented in the following paragraphs.

In the second study, which asks about differences between the experimental and regular groups on the TRUE variables and OPI part scores, a complete vector of scores was collected for each set of variables. Therefore, two multivariate analyses of variance were conducted to test the null hypotheses of no differences between experimental and regular groups.

The multivariate analysis of variance for the TRUE variables is summarized in Table 4.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Insert Table 4 about here.
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Table 3

Comparison of Experimental (E_1) Versus Regular (R_1) Groups on TSRT

	Level	Sum	Mean	Observations
Experimental 202-301	1	5033	218.826	23
Regular 202 only	2	5530	212.692	26

Grand Mean = 215.571

One-Way Analysis of Variance

Source	Corrected Sums of Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Mean Square	F	Approximate Significance Level
Between Levels	459	1	459.000	2.91	.10
Error	7414	47	157.745		
TOTAL	7873	48			

Table 4

Comparison of Experimental (E_2) Versus

Regular (R_2) Groups on TRUE Variables

Variable	Means		Standard Deviations		Univariate* F Ratio	Significance Level p <
	E_2	R_2	E_2	R_2		
TSRT	160.833	158.490	19.099	16.070	1.0328	0.3104
Rokeach	- 33.135	- 31.409	32.861	36.706	0.1372	0.7115
Urban Ed	27.444	26.772	5.488	5.165	0.9075	0.3420
Ed Scale	15.878	10.181	10.506	9.362	18.9299	0.0001*

* A multivariate analysis of variance was carried out for all 4 variables prior to the univariate analysis. The multivariate F ratio for a test of equality of E and R across all 4 variables was calculated to be 5.1461 with 4 and 234 *df* ($p < .0006$).

The F ratio for the multivariate test of equality of mean vectors was significant at $p < .0006$. An inspection of the univariate source or sources responsible for the multivariate significance shows that the two groups differed only on the Education Scale. The difference between the experimental and control group on the Education Scale was significant at $p < .0001$ level with the experimental group having a mean score of 15.9 as compared with a score of 10.18 for the regular groups. Thus, students selecting the experimental group do not differ from students selecting from the regular groups on the TSRT, Rokeach Dogmatism Scale or the Urban Education Scale. However, students selecting the experimental group are more progressive on the Education Scale than are those selecting the regular sections.

Table 5 is a summary table for the multivariate analysis of variance for the OPI part scores. The F ratio for the multivariate test of equality of mean vectors was significant at the $p < .076$ level.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Insert Table 5 about here.
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Several of the univariate analyses of variance for the respective OPI variables are significant at or beyond the .05 level: thinking introversion, complexity, autonomy, social extroversion, altruism, and practical outlook. By inspecting the group means, one may discover the direction of the differences between the experimental and the control group. The experimental group was higher than the regular group on thinking introversion, complexity, autonomy, social extroversion, altruism, and lower on practical outlook. Therefore, one may conclude

Table 5

Comparison of Experimental (E_2) Versus

Regular (R_2) Groups on OPI Variables

Variable	Means		Standard Deviations		Univariate* F Ratio	Significance Level p <
	E_2	R_2	E_2	R_2		
Thinking Introversion	23.424	20.620	7.624	7.116	5.623	.0190*
Theoretical Orientation	16.758	15.272	5.201	5.134	3.184	.0763
Estheticism	12.788	11.598	4.134	5.010	2.500	.1158
Complexity	15.515	12.880	4.881	5.116	10.589	.0014*
Autonomy	23.985	21.565	6.653	6.672	5.067	.0258*
Religious Orientation	10.955	10.489	4.470	4.356	0.429	.5134
Social Extroversion	26.682	24.141	5.630	6.978	5.960	.0158*
Impulse Expression	26.803	25.185	8.202	9.217	1.297	.2564
Personal Integration	34.273	32.913	9.304	10.725	0.669	.4080
Anxiety Level	13.364	12.870	4.198	4.519	0.467	.4863
Altruism	24.470	22.522	4.632	4.805	6.508	.0117*
Practical Outlook	14.591	16.761	5.017	4.976	7.259	.0079*
Masculinity-Femininity	23.303	24.728	4.733	5.669	2.780	.0975
Response Bias	12.455	12.533	4.652	4.510	0.011	.9159

* A multivariate analysis of variance was carried out for all 14 variables prior to the univariate analysis. The multivariate F ratio for a test of equality of E and R across all 14 variables was calculated to be 1.6366 with 14 and 143 *df* ($p < .0761$).

that students selecting the experimental treatment are different from those selecting the regular treatment on thinking introversion, complexity, autonomy, social extroversion, altruism, and practical outlook. There are not self-selection differences between the two groups on theoretical orientation, estheticism, religious orientation, impulse expression, personal integration, anxiety level, masculinity-femininity and response bias.

In the search for possible hypotheses for future studies, a study of the relationships among the several experimental variables was constructed. The variables involved included the APQ variables described in the Cole and Musser paper (1973) and achievement, personality, and the TRUE variables. The treatments received by the experimental and control groups were somewhat confounded. Some of the students in the regular Human Growth and Development and Social and Philosophic Foundations courses engaged in a wide variety of field experiences just as the experimental students did. The choice of certain field experiences and the involvement in a wide range of field activities may be more a function of personality or achievement variables than the particular treatment received by a student. In addition, since data were available on achievement for only part of the students, the regular section, the relationship between achievement and these other variables can be investigated by a correlation methodology. It should be pointed out, however, that only the students in the regular sections took the two achievement tests, a mid-term and a final. On all other variables, both the experimental and the control groups

have comparable measures. Table 6 reports the correlation of each variable with all of the other variables. Significant correlations are indicated by a single or a double asterisk for the .05 and .01 levels of significance, respectively.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Insert Table 6 about here.
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Discussion and Conclusions

Are students who enter the experimental program different from those entering the regular program? Or, do different types of students select each program? They do not differ on the Teaching Situation Reaction Test, the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale, or the Urban Education Scale. Furthermore, they do not differ on the OPI Scales of theoretical orientation, estheticism, religious orientation, impulse expression, personal integration, anxiety level, masculinity-femininity, and response bias. However, students in the experimental group have higher scores on the Education Scale, and on the OPI Scales of thinking introversion, complexity, autonomy, social extroversion, and altruism, and have lower scores on practical outlook.

Are students in the experimental program different from those in the regular program after receiving instruction? They do not differ on the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale, the Education Scale and Teaching Situation Reaction Test, although the difference on the Teaching Situation Reaction Test did approach significance closely enough, but opposite from the direction expected, to warrant its continued investigation. In fact, the difference might have been more pronounced if the regular

Table 6

Correlations between TRUE variables, OPI Subscales, APQ Part Scores, and Achievement Tests

	TSRT	ROKEACH	URBAN ED	ED SCALE	MID-TERM
TSRT	1.000	-0.044	0.254**	0.120	0.258**
Rokeach	-0.044	1.000	-0.218**	-0.266**	-0.236**
Urban Ed	0.254**	-0.218**	1.000	0.378**	0.532**
Ed Scale	0.120	-0.266**	0.378**	1.000	0.296**
Mid-Term	0.258**	-0.236**	0.532**	0.296**	1.000
Final	0.165*	-0.076	0.582**	0.171*	0.706**
APQ CM	0.113	-0.108	0.106	0.305**	0.099
APQ IA	0.056	0.089	-0.038	0.152	-0.283**
APQ BD	0.003	0.085	-0.011	0.101	-0.122
APQ ATK	0.165*	0.059	0.099	0.264**	0.011
APQ RT	0.157	0.133	0.092	0.159*	-0.032
APQ UMS	0.092	-0.046	-0.032	0.040	-0.182
APQ PFW	0.137	-0.040	0.108	0.240**	-0.026
APQ POS	-0.023	0.021	-0.031	-0.116	-0.098
APQ REEP	0.174*	0.068	0.166*	0.292**	0.030
APQ REPF	0.155	0.002	0.037	0.268**	-0.076
APQ RRPF	-0.052	0.003	-0.041	-0.057	0.173*
APQ LCS	-0.075	-0.042	-0.040	0.127	0.151
APQ LFW	0.016	-0.047	0.107	0.290**	0.015
OPI 1	-0.027	-0.236**	0.382**	0.255**	0.234*
OPI 2	0.040	0.250**	0.189*	0.175*	0.221*
OPI 3	-0.053	-0.107	0.228**	0.199*	0.052
OPI 4	-0.135	-0.139	0.031	0.331**	-0.040
OPI 5	-0.037	-0.401**	0.333**	0.361**	0.273**
OPI 6	0.016	-0.127	-0.068	0.164*	-0.062
OPI 7	-0.029	-0.150	-0.162*	0.015	-0.059
OPI 8	-0.060	0.156	-0.203*	0.154	-0.298**
OPI 9	-0.026	-0.384**	0.105	-0.057	0.065
OPI 10	0.083	-0.353**	0.139	-0.008	0.019
OPI 11	-0.022	-0.357**	0.350**	0.194*	0.258*
OPI 12	0.129	0.363**	-0.342**	-0.300**	-0.195
OPI 13	0.007	-0.025	-0.091	-0.183*	-0.036
OPI 14	0.051	-0.284**	0.238**	-0.023	0.212*

	FINAL	APQ CM	APQ IA	APQ BD	APQ ATK
TSRT	0.165*	-0.113*	0.056	0.003	0.165*
Rokeach	-0.076	-0.108	0.089	0.085	0.059
Urban Ed.	0.582**	0.106	-0.038	-0.011	0.099
Ed Scale	0.171*	0.305**	0.152	0.101	0.264**
Mid-Term	0.706**	0.099	-0.283**	-0.122	0.011
Final	1.000	-0.140	-0.232	-0.096	0.053
APQ CM	-0.140	1.000	0.408**	0.184**	0.339**
APQ IA	-0.232*	0.408**	1.000	0.344**	0.549**
APQ BD	-0.096	0.184**	0.344**	1.000	0.458**
APQ ATK	0.053	0.339**	0.549**	0.458**	1.000
APQ RT	0.000	0.282**	0.517**	0.555**	0.603**
APQ UMS	-0.167	0.220**	0.283**	0.334**	0.255**
APQ PFW	-0.157	0.653**	0.347**	0.082	0.178*
APQ POS	-0.029	-0.326**	-0.119	-0.101	-0.176*
APQ REEP	0.004	0.315**	0.195**	0.135	0.282**
APQ REFP	0.029	0.331**	0.321**	0.070	0.235**
APQ RRPF	0.068	-0.145	-0.202**	0.044	-0.088
APQ LCS	0.072	-0.077	-0.043	0.163*	0.149*
APQ LFW	-0.029	0.338**	0.406**	0.130	0.313**
OPI 1	0.200	0.260**	0.157	-0.043	0.203*
OPI 2	0.147	0.269**	0.134	-0.049	0.111
OPI 3	0.105	0.296**	0.126	-0.077	0.132
OPI 4	-0.151	0.191	0.283**	-0.037	0.104
OPI 5	0.087	0.147	0.089	-0.079	-0.006
OPI 6	-0.135	-0.075	-0.030	0.038	0.031
OPI 7	-0.198	0.128	0.392**	-0.007	0.235*
OPI 8	-0.341**	0.060	0.160	-0.032	0.102
OPI 9	0.049	0.075	0.207*	0.114	0.072
OPI 10	0.048	0.087	0.078	0.202*	0.047
OPI 11	0.228*	0.196	0.203*	-0.057	0.211*
OPI 12	-0.047	-0.255*	-0.267**	0.005	-0.170
OPI 13	0.020	-0.146	-0.078	0.096	-0.172
OPI 14	0.265*	0.146	0.137	0.043	0.125

	APQ RT	APQ UMS	APQ PFW	APQ POS	APQ REEP
TSRT	0.157	0.092	0.137	-0.023	0.174*
Rokeach	0.133	-0.046	-0.040	0.021	0.068
Urban Ed	0.092	-0.032	0.108	-0.031	0.166*
Ed Scale	0.159*	0.040	0.240**	-0.116	0.292**
Mid-Term	-0.032	-0.182	-0.026	-0.098	-0.030
Final	0.000	-0.167	-0.157	-0.029	0.004
APQ CM	0.282**	0.220**	0.653**	-0.326**	0.315**
APQ IA	0.517**	0.283**	0.347**	-0.119	0.195**
APQ BD	0.555**	0.334**	0.082	-0.101	0.135
APQ ATK	0.603**	0.255*	0.178*	-0.176*	0.282**
APQ RT	1.000	0.265**	0.217**	-0.113	0.254**
APQ UMA	0.265**	1.000	0.213**	-0.088	0.018
APQ PFW	0.217**	0.213**	1.000	-0.268**	0.263**
APQ POS	-0.113	-0.088	-0.268**	1.000	0.118
APQ REEP	0.254**	0.018	0.263**	0.118	1.000
APQ REPF	0.267**	0.082	0.374**	-0.099	0.558**
APQ RRPF	-0.030	-0.002	-0.069	0.041	-0.181*
APQ LCS	0.065	0.095	-0.116	-0.114	-0.049
APQ LFW	0.353**	0.186*	0.369**	-0.170*	0.198**
OPI 1	0.095	0.137	0.120	-0.051	0.261*
OPI 2	0.079	0.119	0.077	0.013	0.216*
OPI 3	0.099	0.050	0.216*	-0.099	0.115
OPI 4	0.014	-0.066	0.172	0.033	0.112
OPI 5	0.003	-0.231	0.091	-0.082	0.028
OPI 6	0.012	-0.109	-0.144	0.021	0.006
OPI 7	0.023	0.128	0.138	-0.145	0.074
OPI 8	0.052	0.056	0.142	-0.085	0.087
OPI 9	0.103	-0.005	0.015	-0.043	0.023
OPI 10	-0.039	0.048	-0.087	-0.031	-0.021
OPI 11	0.137	-0.029	0.068	-0.128	0.124
OPI 12	-0.085	0.073	-0.067	-0.024	-0.187
OPI 13	-0.168	0.048	-0.170	0.109	-0.001
OPI 14	0.097	0.037	-0.002	-0.005	0.098

	APQ REPF	APQ RRPF	APQ LCS	APQ LFW	OPI 1
TSRT	0.155	-0.052	-0.075	0.016	-0.027
Rokeach	0.002	0.003	-0.042	-0.047	-0.236**
Urban Ed	0.037	-0.041	-0.040	0.107	0.382**
Ed Scale	0.268**	-0.057	0.127	0.290**	0.255**
Mid-Term	-0.076	0.173*	0.151	0.015	0.234*
Final	0.029	0.068	0.072	-0.029	0.200
APQ CM	0.331**	-0.145	-0.077	0.338**	0.260**
APQ IA	0.321**	-0.202**	-0.043	0.406**	0.157
APQ BD	0.070	0.044	0.163*	0.130	-0.043
APQ ATK	0.235**	-0.088	0.149*	0.313**	0.203*
APQ RT	0.267**	-0.030	0.065	0.353**	0.095
APQ UMA	0.082	-0.002	0.095	0.186*	0.137
APQ PFW	0.374**	-0.069	-0.116	0.369**	0.120
APQ POS	-0.099	0.041	-0.114	-0.170*	-0.051
APQ REEP	0.558**	-0.181*	-0.049	0.198**	0.261*
APQ REPF	1.000	-0.330**	0.011	0.276**	0.209*
APQ RRPF	-0.330**	1.000	0.368**	0.026	-0.054
APQ LCS	0.011	0.368**	1.000	-0.009	0.218*
APQ LFW	0.276**	0.026	-0.009	1.000	0.126
OPI 1	0.209*	-0.054	0.218*	0.126	1.000
OPI 2	0.103	-0.191	-0.034	-0.095	0.563**
OPI 3	0.210*	0.013	0.087	0.097	0.601**
OPI 4	0.163	-0.110	-0.199	0.125	0.338**
OPI 5	0.038	0.046	-0.000	0.188	0.278**
OPI 6	-0.088	0.021	0.002	0.000	0.032
OPI 7	0.161	-0.171	-0.095	0.175	0.281**
OPI 8	0.191	-0.069	-0.010	0.145	0.039
OPI 9	0.061	-0.032	0.007	0.062	0.232**
OPI 10	-0.061	0.055	0.080	0.025	0.212**
OPI 11	0.021	-0.046	-0.027	0.194	0.539**
OPI 12	-0.141	0.062	-0.011	-0.235*	-0.575**
OPI 13	-0.002	-0.082	0.045	-0.106	-0.164**
OPI 14	-0.025	-0.055	0.043	0.018	0.452**

	OPI 2	OPI 3	OPI 4	OPI 5	OPI 6
TSRT	0.040	-0.053	-0.135	-0.037	0.016
Rokeach	-0.250**	-0.107	-0.139	-0.401**	-0.127
Urban Ed	0.189*	0.228**	0.031	0.333**	-0.068
Ed Scale	0.175*	0.199*	0.331**	0.361**	0.164*
Mid-Term	0.221*	0.052	-0.040	0.273**	-0.062
Final	0.147	0.105	-0.151	0.087	-0.135
APQ CM	0.269**	0.296**	0.191	0.147	-0.075
APQ IA	0.134	0.126	0.283**	0.089	-0.030
APQ BD	-0.049	-0.077	-0.037	-0.079	0.038
APQ ATK	0.111	0.132	0.104	-0.006	0.031
APQ RT	0.079	0.099	0.014	0.003	0.012
APQ UMA	0.119	0.050	-0.066	-0.231*	-0.109
APQ PFW	0.077	0.216*	0.172	0.091	-0.144
APQ POS	0.013	-0.099	0.033	-0.082	0.021
APQ REEP	0.216*	0.115	0.112	0.028	0.006
APQ REPF	0.103	0.210*	0.163	0.038	-0.088
APQ RRPF	-0.191	0.013	-0.110	0.046	0.021
APQ LCS	-0.034	0.087	-0.199	-0.000	0.002
APQ LFW	-0.095	0.097	0.125	0.188	0.000
OPI 1	0.563**	0.601**	0.338**	0.278**	0.032
OPI 2	1.000	0.307**	0.360**	0.237**	0.126
OPI 3	0.307**	1.000	0.302**	0.185*	0.054
OPI 4	0.360**	0.302**	1.000	0.520**	0.370**
OPI 5	0.237**	0.185*	0.520**	1.000	0.479**
OPI 6	0.126	0.054	0.370**	0.479**	1.000
OPI 7	0.218**	0.159*	0.270**	0.018	0.025
OPI 8	0.032	0.241**	0.553**	0.231**	0.359**
OPI 9	0.223**	0.001	-0.095	0.034	-0.164*
OPI 10	0.209**	-0.022	-0.024	0.029	-0.035
OPI 11	0.279**	0.288**	0.128	0.217**	-0.168*
OPI 12	-0.433**	-0.337**	-0.588**	-0.689**	-0.354**
OPI 13	0.230**	-0.449**	-0.078	-0.144	-0.090
OPI 14	0.561**	0.242**	-0.101	-0.039	-0.238**

	OPI 7	OPI 8	OPI 9	OPI 10	OPI 11
TSRT	-0.029	-0.060	-0.026	0.083	-0.022
Rokeach	-0.150	0.156	-0.384**	-0.353**	-0.357**
Urban Ed	-0.162*	-0.203*	0.105	0.139	0.350**
Ed Scale	0.015	0.154	-0.057	-0.008	0.194*
Mid-Term	-0.059	-0.298**	0.065	0.019	0.258*
Final	-0.198	-0.341**	0.049	0.048	0.228*
APQ CM	0.128	0.060	0.075	0.087	0.196
APQ IA	0.392**	0.160	0.207*	0.078	0.203*
APQ BD	-0.007	-0.032	0.114	0.202*	-0.057
APQ ATK	0.235*	0.102	0.072	0.047	0.211*
APQ RT	0.023	0.052	0.103	-0.039	0.137
APQ UMA	0.128	0.056	-0.005	0.048	-0.029
APQ PFW	0.138	0.142	0.015	-0.087	0.068
APQ POS	-0.145	-0.085	-0.043	-0.031	-0.128
APQ REEP	0.074	0.087	0.023	-0.021	0.124
APQ REPF	0.161	0.191	0.061	-0.061	0.021
APQ RRPF	-0.171	-0.069	-0.032	0.055	-0.046
APQ LCS	-0.095	-0.010	0.007	0.080	-0.027
APQ LFW	0.175	0.145	0.062	0.025	0.194
OPI 1	0.281**	0.039	0.232**	0.212*	0.539**
OPI 2	0.218**	0.032	0.223**	0.209*	0.279**
OPI 3	0.159*	0.241**	0.001	-0.022	0.288**
OPI 4	0.270**	0.553**	-0.095	-0.024	0.128
OPI 5	0.018	0.231**	0.034	0.029	0.217**
OPI 6	0.025	0.359**	-0.164*	-0.035	-0.168*
OPI 7	1.000	0.198*	0.392**	0.347**	0.414**
OPI 8	0.198*	1.000	-0.483**	-0.405**	-0.304**
OPI 9	0.392**	-0.483**	1.000	0.746**	0.606**
OPI 10	0.347**	-0.405**	0.746**	1.000	0.464**
OPI 11	0.414**	-0.304**	0.606**	0.464**	1.000
OPI 12	-0.285**	-0.120	-0.266**	-0.228**	-0.442**
OPI 13	-0.109	-0.151	0.257**	0.302**	-0.183*
OPI 14	0.276**	-0.467**	0.701**	0.551**	0.554**

	OPI 12	OPI 13	OPI 14
TSRT	0.129	0.007	0.051
Rokeach	0.363**	-0.025	-0.284**
Urban Ed	-0.342**	-0.091	0.238**
Ed Scale	-0.300**	-0.183*	-0.023
Mid-Term	-0.195	-0.036	0.212*
Final	-0.047	0.020	0.265*
APQ CM	-0.255*	-0.146	0.146
APQ IA	-0.267**	-0.078	0.137
APQ BD	0.005	0.096	0.043
APQ ATK	-0.170	-0.172	0.125
APQ RT	-0.085	-0.168	0.097
APQ UMA	0.073	0.048	0.037
APQ PFW	-0.067	-0.170	-0.002
APQ POS	-0.024	0.109	-0.005
APQ REEP	-0.187	-0.001	0.098
APQ REPF	-0.141	-0.002	-0.025
APQ RRPF	0.062	-0.082	-0.055
APQ LCS	-0.011	0.045	0.043
APQ LFW	-0.235*	-0.106	0.018
OPI 1	-0.575**	-0.164*	0.452**
OPI 2	-0.433**	0.230**	0.561**
OPI 3	-0.337**	-0.449**	0.242**
OPI 4	-0.588**	-0.078	-0.101
OPI 5	-0.689**	-0.144	-0.039
OPI 6	-0.354**	-0.090	-0.238**
OPI 7	-0.285**	-0.109	0.276**
OPI 8	-0.120	-0.151	-0.467**
OPI 9	-0.266**	0.257**	0.701**
OPI 10	-0.228**	0.302**	0.551**
OPI 11	-0.442**	-0.183*	0.554**
OPI 12	1.000	0.182*	-0.231**
OPI 13	0.182*	1.000	0.201*
OPI 14	-0.231**	0.201*	1.000

** Denotes significance at the 1% level.

* Denotes significance at the 5% level.

group had received a full year of treatment.

In future studies focus should be upon improving measurement of the program outcomes. Probably changes in behavior do result from the instructional treatments, but the measures selected or developed may not be sensitive to the real treatment effects. To some extent, a move in this direction will be achieved when the current group of students is postested on the locally constructed achievement tests. However, the ultimate test would be some measure of actual teaching effectiveness, perhaps on an independent observation scale.

Future research directions are suggested by the correlation matrix presented in Table 6. Space and time considerations do not permit a discussion of those suggested hypotheses at this time. Another paper will be prepared on this topic in the near future.

References

Cole, Henry P., and Musser, Louise S. "Field Activities Selected by Preservice Teachers in Traditional and Experimental Programs". A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana. February 28, 1973.

Hirst, P., Yonge, G., McConnell, T. R., Webster, H. Omnibus Personality Inventory: Manual. The Psychological Corporation, New York, 1968.

LaBrecque, Richard, and Ravitz, Leonard. "Nova Ratio Studiorum: The Teacher as Entrepreneur". A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, Louisiana. February 28, 1973.

Appendix A

Descriptions of the APQ Scales

Number	Name	Abbreviated Name	Scale Range	Description
1	Commitment	CM	1-5	An average composite of 3 items which measure the average length of time per visit, the number of visits per week and the absolute number of visits to the field assignment by the student.
2	Instructional Activity	IA	1-5	An average composite of 12 items which measure the frequency of the student's direct involvement in a variety of actual teaching activities requiring contact with children.
3	Breadth-Depth of Involvement	BD	1-5	An average composite of 13 items which measure the breadth and frequency of the student's involvement in activities such as attending PTA meetings, school board meetings, visiting, observing and talking with other teachers, seeking out, meeting, talking with a variety of people in the school and school community and seeking out and examining instructional materials, special programs, etc.
4	Application of Theoretic Knowledge	ATK	1-5	An average composite of 9 items designed to measure the frequency and degree to which the student attempts to use in an interpretative and applicative way in practical field situations the theories he encounters in college classrooms and readings.
5	Routine Tasks	RT	1-5	An average composite of 7 items which indicates the degree to which a student was a relatively passive observer or was simply involved in "low level" clerical-maintenance tasks such as washing blackboards, general supervision of playground activity, straightening up the room, etc.

Number	Name	Abbreviated Name	Scale Range	Description
6	Use of Methods Specialists	UMS	1-5	A single item which asked students to report the frequency with which they attempted to solve teaching problems encountered in the field by appealing to a university methods specialist.
7	Percent Time Preparing for Field work	PFW	1-5	A single item which asks students to report the percentage of total class preparation time they expended in preparing for field work. The categories were: 1 = 0-10%, 2 = 11-30%, 3 = 31-50%, 4 = 51-70%, 5 = 71-90%.
8	Preference for Opposite Section	POS	1-5	A single item which indicates liking of the program he was in by asking him if he would have preferred to be enrolled in the opposite section (e.g. experimental or regular as was the case for the individual). This item was reverse scaled.
9	Recommend Expansion Experimental Program	REEP	1-5	A single item which indicates perceived value of the experimental program by asking all students (E groups and R groups) if they thought the experimental program should be expanded.
10	Recommend Experimental Program to Friends	REPF	1-5	A single item which indicates perceived value of the experimental program by asking all students (E groups and R groups) if they would recommend the experimental program to friends.
11	Recommend Regular Program to Friends	RRPF	1-5	A single item which indicates perceived value of the regular program by asking all students (E groups and R groups) if they would recommend the regular program to friends.

Number	Name	Abbreviated Name	Scale Range	Description
12	Learning from Campus Class Sessions	LCS	1-5	A sing'e item which asks students to judge how much they have learned about becoming teachers as a result of class work on campus. Scaled 1-5 from "very little" to "a great deal".
13	Learning from Field work Activities	LFW	1-5	A single item which asks students to judge how much they have learned about becoming a teacher as a result of field work. Scaled 1-5 from "very little" to "a great deal".

Appendix B

Descriptions of the OPI Scales

Thinking Introversion	OPI Subscore 1
Theoretical Orientation	OPI Subscore 2
Estheticism	OPI Subscore 3
Complexity	OPI Subscore 4
Autonomy	OPI Subscore 5
Religious Orientation	OPI Subscore 6
Social Extroversion	OPI Subscore 7
Impulse Expression	OPI Subscore 8
Personal Integration	OPI Subscore 9
Anxiety Level	OPI Subscore 10
Altruism	OPI Subscore 11
Practical Outlook	OPI Subscore 12
Masculinity-Femininity	OPI Subscore 13
Response Bias	OPI Subscore 14